DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 731 HE 002 703

AUTHOR	Many, Wesley A.; And Others
TITLE	In-Service Education in American Senior Colleges and Universities: A Status Report.
INSTITUTION	Northern Illinois Univ., De Kalb. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE	[69]
NOTE	12p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Higher Education; *Inservice Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Inservice Teaching; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

Formal programs of in-service education for faculty in American colleges and universities generally have been neglected and are lacking in approximately half of the institutions. In only half of the senior colleges and universities in the United States is the need to improve the professional development and performance of college and university faculties being approached through systematic programs of in-service education. However, of those who reported no such in-service program, over two-thirds indicated plans for initiating such a program. Thus, there appears to be a trend toward in-service education for higher education faculties. (HS)

ED057731

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION IN AMERICAN SENIOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: A STATUS REPORT

Wesley A. Many, Joseph R. Ellis and Peter Abrams
Professors of Education, Northern Illinois University

The tremendous explosion of knowledge, accompanied by a vast increase in numbers of students and faculty, and an expansion in scope of concern and area of activity has characterized higher education in the United States since the end of World War II. It is these major factors that have contributed to making American colleges and universities primary sources of change with an impact that has pervaded much of the society. These institutions have provided evidence and meaning to the concept that an individual's education is never complete; that personal and organizational growth can be continuous; that development never reaches full fruition, and, indeed, that "truth is becoming".

Through teaching, research and service functions, higher education faculties have provided a general application of the above concepts in nearly every field of human endeavor, particularly, in a variety of professional and community situations. Obviously, much of the change now occuring throughout American culture is attributable to the discovery, diffusion, and service efforts of these faculties.

Higher education, as an object for investigation, having expended much of its energy questioning, analyzing, criticizing, modifying and regenerating practically everything but itself, may have remained relatively insulated from the application of these processes to its own self-assessment. In

HE002703

directing their concerns toward others with an intensely systematic, objective, and scientific procedure, faculty members may collectively and unknowingly have followed a philosophy espoused by some athletic coaches, i.e., "the best defense is a good offense." The faculty's approach to the evaluation of its institution's problems, programs, practices and personnel's performance often has been incongruent with the attitudes and disciplined approaches that they have advocated and applied when considering situations within their areas of specialization.

The student unrest that has manifested itself increasingly during the past five years may be a symptom of the ignored or unexamined basic problems of higher education. Recent demands for change have forced confrontations which consequently threaten the very nature of higher education. Have American senior colleges and universities been too preoccupied with the needs and problems of others; or have they been remiss in examining their own goals, practices and problems? Do they plan change for themselves? What provisions do they make to ensure their own continuous growth and regeneration? What formal and systematic procedures do they employ to promote the development of their single most valuable resource: their faculties?

Perusal of available literature pertaining to college staff preparation reveals minimal attention to this area. The following statement in 1967 by Wise (3) in the article "Who Teaches the Teachers?" typifies the state of the literature.

> The case for considering the preparation of college teachers was aptly put in a report of a conference held in 1949:

> The American college teacher is the only high level professional man in the American scene who enters upon a career with neither the prerequisite trial of competence nor experience in the use of the tools of his profession.

This judgement rendered in a summary of several days deliberation on the topic seems almost as pertinent today as it was seventeen years ago.

Wise, again quoting from "Who Teaches the Teachers?" states:

> Despite lively discussions of the responsibilities of graduate schools to help induct novices into the teaching profession and some evidence of increased interest in the problem on the part of employing colleges, in most institutions this interest is expressed vaguely and support is inadequately staffed and financed. Only a few institutions have, as yet, instituted programs to provide relevant experience to the embryonic college teacher.

Even this statement falls short of the total problem area for no mention is made of that university population experienced in college level teaching. What provisions are made to keep these educators abreast of developments in their areas of responsibility? It was within the context of this question that the study reported here was conceived and conducted.

Problem. The study sought to determine the extent to which college and universities in the United States provide formally organized programs of inservice education to improve the professional development and performance of their faculties.

Procedure. Twelve-hundred and fifty academically orientated and accredited senior colleges and universities listed in the 1964 edition of American Universities and Colleges (1) were selected for inclusion in the study. A questionnaire was developed and mailed to the office of the president of

each of these institutions. The initial mailing took place in the Fall of 1968 and a follow-up was made approximately one month later.

Data were treated by numbers and percents to yield descriptions and permit comparisons on the basis of kind, type, objectives, and size of institutions.

Definition of Terms. For purposes of the study, the following terms were used as defined below:

In-service education - an institution's purposeful and organized efforts to promote by appropriate means the professional development and performance of its teaching staff.

College and university teachers - those professional persons employed by an institution of higher education and whose primary responsibility is to provide instruction for students participating in post high school study.

Service - assisting the population of interest to the university or college through institutionally related activities.

Research - careful, critical, disciplined inquiry, varying in technique and method according to the nature and conditions of the problem identified.

Teaching - the act of instructing in an educational setting.

Findings. Questionnaires were returned from 958 or 76.6% of the sample of 1,250 American senior colleges and universities. Most of the instruments were completed by the institution's president, vice-president or dean of faculties. The data referred to the academic year, 1968-69.

When asked if their institution had a formal program for faculty in-service education as defined above, 503, or slightly more than half, (52.4%), of the respondents said yes, (see TABLE I), while 429, or 44.7%, reported having no such program.

TABLE I

Total Response to the Question, "Do You Consider Your School to Have a Formal In-Service Education Program as Defined Above?"
(N=958)

Yes		No		No Response	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
503	52.4%	429	44.7%	26	2.7%

An analysis of the data by kind of institution (see TABLE II) found that more church-related colleges and universities (59.8%) reported having in-service education programs for their faculties than did either state supported schools (49.7%) or those that were private and non-denominational (41.2%). More of the single purpose institutions (57.3%) reported having such programs than did the multi-purpose schools (51.9%), while responses from institutions whose objectives were primarily liberal arts indicated that 59.2% had in-service programs as compared with 54.2% for schools with primarily professional objectives and 50.8% for those schools with combinations of liberal arts and professional objectives.

An analysis of the data based upon the institution's size (number of students and number of faculty), found that more of the smaller schools--less than 3,000 students and less than 350 faculty--reported having in-service programs for their faculties than did the larger institutions (see TABLE II).

When asked about plans for future faculty in-service education programs, 70.6% or 303 of the 429 schools that reported having no such programs, indicated that they intended to initiate one (see TABLE III).

An analysis of the data from those institutions with in-service programs found that from 68% to 72% of them planned program modifications. When compared on the basis of kind, type of institution and institutional objective, little variance was found (see TABLE IV). A consideration on the basis of the size of the institution found, with one exception, a high percentage--ranging from 76% to 89%--who were planning program modifications. Those schools with a student body of from 3,000 to 10,000 varied

TABLE II

Responses by Kind, Type, Objective and Size of the Institution to the Question, "Do You Consider Your School to Have a Formal In-Service Education Program as Defined Above?"*

INSTITUTIONS	Number	%	YES Number	%	NO Number	%
By Kind:						
State	317	33.0	148	49.7	151	47.5
Municipal	4	0.4	1	25.0	3	75.0
Church related	435	45.3	260	59.8	162	37.2
Private non-demon.	182	19.0	75	41.2	101	55.5
Other	16	1.7	8	50.0	8	50.0
By Type:						
Single Purpose	373	41.3	213	57.3	160	42.9
Multi Purpose	531	58.7	274	51.9	257	47.2
By Objective:						
Primarily Liberal Arts	334	36.0	197	59.2	137	41.2
Primarily Professional	83	8.9	45	54.2	38	45.7
Combination of LA-Prof.	511	55.1	259	50.8	252	49.4
By Number of Students:						
Under 500	86	9.4	45	52.3	41	47.6
501 - 1,000	244	26.6	139	56.9	105	43.0
1,001 - 3,000	310	33.8	181	58.3	129	41.6
3,001 - 10,000	190	20.7	91	47.8	99	52.1
10,001 - 20,000	64	7.0	29	45.3	35	54.6
20,001 - over	22	2.4	10	45.4	12	54.5
By Number of Faculty:						
Under 50	183	20.2	105	57.5	78	40.5
51 - 150	409	45.1	234	57.4	175	44.7
151 - 350	149	16.4	76	51.3	73	41.5
351 - 800	106	11.7	50	48.3	56	52.4
801 - 1,200	33	3.6	12	32.5	21	64.4
1,201 - over	26	2.9	11	41.8	15	60.7

*Respondents did not answer every question, consequently percentages often do not equal 100.

TABLE III

Responses From Institutions Reporting As Having No In-Service Education Program to the Question, "Are There Plans for Modifying Your School's In-Service Education Program?"*

(N=429)

YES		NO		NO RESPONSE	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
303	70.6	61	14.2	65	15.1

*Respondents did not answer every question, consequently percentages often do not equal 100.

TABLE IV

Response by Kind, Type, Objective and Size of the Institution to the Question, "Are There Plans for Modifying Your School's In-Service Education Program?"*

INSTITUTIONS	Number	%	YES Number	YES %	NO Number	NO %
By Kind:						
State	317	33.0	221	69.5	59	18.6
Municipal	4	0.4	0	0.0	1	25.0
Church Related	435	45.3	307	70.6	79	18.2
Private Non-Denom.	182	19.0	124	68.1	34	18.7
Other	16	1.7	12	75.0	3	18.8
By Type:						
Single Purpose	373	41.3	272	70.6	67	17.4
Multi-Purpose	531	58.7	375	68.9	107	19.7
By Objective:						
Primarily Liberal Arts	334	36.0	249	72.4	53	15.4
Primarily Professional	83	8.9	58	69.0	16	19.0
Combination of LA-Prof.	511	55.1	356	67.8	108	20.6
By Number of Students:						
Under 500	80	8.4	63	78.7	17	21.2
501 - 1,000	215	22.4	164	76.2	51	23.7
1,001 - 3,000	289	30.2	238	82.3	51	17.6
3,001 - 10,000	76	7.9	30	39.4	46	60.5
10,001 - 20,000	54	5.6	48	88.8	6	11.1
20,001 - over	17	1.8	13	76.5	4	23.5
By Number of Faculty:						
50 or less	159	16.6	115	72.3	44	27.6
51 - 150	374	39.0	306	81.8	68	18.1
151 - 350	138	14.4	106	76.8	32	23.1
351 - 800	103	10.7	83	80.5	20	19.4
801 - 1,200	29	3.0	25	86.2	4	13.7
1,201 - over	21	2.2	16	76.1	5	23.8

*Respondents did not answer every question, consequently percentages often do not equal 100.

TABLE V

Opinions Reported by College Administrators Regarding the Value of Their Institution's In-Service Education Program for Faculty Teaching, Research and Service Functions.*

FUNCTION	VERY IMPORTANT		IMPORTANT		UNIMPORTANT	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Teaching	257	50.9	244	48.3	4	0.7
Research	79	17.0	246	53.0	139	30.0
Service	92	20.0	270	58.8	97	21.1

*Respondents did not answer every question, consequently percentages often do not equal 100.

from the pattern (see TABLE IV) noticeably in that 30 of 76 schools, or 39%, reported that they planned to make no modifications in their in-service programs.

The college and university administrators who completed the questionnaire for the study were asked to indicate their opinions regarding the value which their in-service education program had for the three major functions of their faculties (see TABLE V). It should be noted that these administrators ascribed the greatest value to the contribution which in-service education made to teaching, followed by its importance for service and research functions in that order. Their overall response indicated that they deemed in-service education to be of value to their faculties.

Conclusions. 1. Only slightly more than half of the colleges and universities in the United States provide a formal in-service education program for the development of their faculties.

2. While there was some variation in the percentages of institutions having in-service programs when viewed in terms of the kind, type, objective and size of the institution, the differences were not large and all categories were found to have relatively few schools providing such programs.

3. Over two-thirds of the institutions which do not now have an in-service program as defined in the study report that they intend to initiate one.

4. While there was some variation in the percentage of institutions who planned to modify the school's in-service education program, when viewed in terms of the kind, type, objective and size of the institution, the differences were not large with the exception of those schools enrolling 3,000 to 10,000 students.

5. College and university administrators ascribed considerable value to in-service education programs for their faculty, especially regarding its contribution to the teaching function. However, a difference was noted between their expressed valuing of in-service programs and their reported in-service practices. The reported practices lagged behind the values that were given to in-service education.

6. In summary, formal programs of in-service education for faculty in American colleges and universities generally have been neglected and are lacking in approximately half of the institutions. In only half of the senior colleges and universities in the United States is the need to improve the professional development and performance of college and university faculties being approached through systematic programs of in-service education. However, of those who reported no such in-service program, over two-thirds indicated plans for initiating such a program. Thus, there appears to be a trend toward in-service education for higher education faculties.

Recommendations. In-service education may provide a vehicle by which higher education can cope with its problems effectively. A rigorous self-study should be conducted by each school with the aim of providing programs for staff improvement that will facilitate the optimal development of both the faculty and the institution.

References

1. Carter, Allan T., (Editor), American Universities and Colleges, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1964.

2. Moron, William E., "The Study of University Organization," Journal of Higher Education, 39:144-151, March, 1968.

3. Wise, W. Max, "Who Teaches the Teacher?", Improving College Teaching, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, p. 77, 1967.